audaces (so also Courtney). But, as I observed in my review of Courtney, this type of adjective-infinitive combination usually has an epithetic quality expressing disposition, capacity, skill, fitness or the like; here we have a particular occasion which does not allow for a general statement of the men's behaviour as *audax*. The *apparatus* (p. 374) does not record that *pectore* is the transmitted reading in line 15; H.'s adoption of Bursian's conjecture, *obstructa in … pectora*, results in an unparalleled expression for introducing direct speech. In line 19 I would suggest *terris* for the corrupt +*liberis*/*libris*+; the sense will be 'another world untouched by the human world (*terris*)'. Meyer's conjecture *bellis*, printed by H., seems too restricted a feature to differentiate adequately this *alium orbem*, which in 22–3 is described as *diuum quietas sedes*. The punctuation of lines 20–21 (*di … oculos*) as a question continuing the question introduced by *anne* in line 18 seems inconsistent with the context. The question introduced by *anne* in 18 (*alio … orbem*) is a suggested answer to *quo ferimur*? (16); *di … oculos* introduces a new thought that does not form part of the preceding question but instead introduces the idea of provoking the anger of the gods by transgressing mortal limits. This statement, essentially an injunction to turn back, sets up the following question (*quid … sedes* 21–23), which expresses the fear that Germanicus' fleet is violating the sacred abode of the gods. p. 403 commentary on fr. 238.1: the phrase *semine nymphae* is described as 'a disturbing collocation'. The Greek parallels cited do nothing to alleviate the difficulty because they illustrate the use of *semen*/*semina* to mean 'offspring/seed of', not origin 'from the seed of', the mother; the reference to Lucretius 4.1211 (*materno semine*) reveals more about Epicurus' understanding of female physiology than it does about standard epic phraseology for identifying lineage. It may be possible that *mutatae nymphae* is an adnominal rather than a possessive genitive, explaining the identity of *Lycaonio semine*: 'you [Arcas], born of Lycaon's seed, the transformed nymph', meaning that his mother Callisto is to be identified as the seed of Lycaon, and not that Callisto herself is the source of the seed. Another possibility is to read *mutata nympha* (ablative) in apposition to *semine*, which would yield the same sense as above. In the translation of this fragment *raptam* is rendered 'after her abduction' (p. 238), which is inappropriate to the context; in the commentary (p. 403) the word is correctly translated 'carried off'. It should be noted that *rapere* is the *uox propria* for various forms of apotheosis (Ovid, *Met*. 2.506, Callisto and Arcas; 9.271, Hercules; 15.840, 845, Caesar the Dictator; Livy 1.16.2, Romulus). p. 391 (fr. 239): *sine fluctibus* is translated 'without help of the waves'; clearly the meaning is 'without coming into contact with the waves'.

At the risk of seeming ungrateful for the bounty produced from these gathered crumbs, I think that Cicero's 'flauit ab Epiro lenissimus Onchesmites' deserves a place in this volume as a poem-fragment rather than as a mere *testimonium* (1), and not only because it comes within its chronological limits (see Lyne, *CQ* 28 (1978), 167 = *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry* (2007), 60). The fact that a Roman consular, in a moment of epistolary relaxation, tossed off a line, which, if it had come from the hand of Cornelius Gallus, would be a showpiece of the *doctus poeta*'s anemological knowledge and spondaic swagger, leaves one with a renewed appreciation for the mansion of the Muses; it has many rooms, not all of them illuminated by Aratean lamps.

The text is remarkably free of misprints. I noted only two worth mentioning: p. 304 (fr. 180.1), *Tibullo* for *Tibulle* and (fr. 181.2), *hominum* for *hominem*. To borrow the words of the poet Ticida (fr. 103), this book will be *doctorum maxima cura*.

University of Pittsburgh D. Mark Possanza

N. M. HORSFALL, *VIRGIL*, AENEID *7*. *A COMMENTARY* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 198). Leiden: Brill, 2000. Pp. xliv + 566. ISBN 9-00410-842-4. €207.00.

N. M. HORSFALL, *VIRGIL*, AENEID *11*. *A COMMENTARY* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 244). Leiden: Brill, 2003. Pp. xxvii + 505. ISBN 9-00412-934-0. €130.00.

N. M. HORSFALL, *VIRGIL*, AENEID *3*. *A COMMENTARY* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 273). Leiden: Brill, 2006. Pp. liv + 513. ISBN 9-00414-828-0. €165.00.

By this late date Horsfall 7 has been scrutinized and scrupled, its praises sung, its faults faulted. The 'unorthodox dodges' that distinguish H.'s editions are not always helpful. Good, though, is his use of **O**, **P** and **T** in the margins of the Latin to indicate notes on orthography, punctuation, and text. The reader is immediately (vv. 4–8) faced with the sequence **TOTTO** and suspects a cryptogram to H.'s beloved Skutsch.

The amplitude of H.'s learning admits no doubt, but on at least one matter his treatment is glaringly uneven: his use of Macrobius. At *Saturnalia* 6.8, for example, there is a discussion of *Aen.* 7.187–8, and the *lituus* particularly — a discussion that, moreover, goes back at least as far as Gellius (*NA* 5.8). Was this really beneath H.'s notice, given the attention he devotes to Macrobius elsewhere (xvii, 'often an extremely intelligent critic of V.')? Though much in Macrobius is nugatory, Heyne praises the discussion (*argutiae*). H. himself is both *amantissimus vetustatis* and given to sphinxine silences, so it is hard to interpret this and similar omissions.

H. is witty (e.g. *ad* 412 *avis*), and shrewdly eloquent in the vein of Gildersleeve: 37–45 are a 'threateningly impressionistic table of contents'; of 205 *fama est obscurior annis* he writes '[e]very word increases the distance between text and credence'. His note on 263 *nostri si tanta cupido* is excellent in every way, and should be required reading. He deserves praise for connecting 619 *morantis* (of the gates of war) with the *aureus ramus cunctans* — obvious, perhaps, but not therefore to be passed over in silence. Yet on *Aeneia nutrix* (7.1), no mention of Odysseus' Eurycleia, nor, on 328–29 (*tot sese vertit in ora / tam saevae facies*), recognition of the (contextually apt) model at *Geo* 1.506, *tam multae scelerum facies*. H. has said, though, that he perceives a 'generation gap' over what counts as a true echo, a clear borrowing. *damnosa quid non*?

Minding the gap, I offer a few observations on the death of Silvia's stag and its aftermath. H. mentions in passing Agamemnon's disastrously successful stag-hunt, referring to (but not citing) Soph., *El.* 566 ff., which may be directly relevant to Virgil for the element of chance (569 τυγχάνει βαλών). Pertinent too is a line from the end of Callimachus' hymn to Artemis (*H.* 3.263, οὐδε γὰρ Ἀτρεΐδης ὀλίγῳ ἔπι κόμπασε μισθῷ) — note that H. argues for Virgil's use of the same text elsewhere (*ad* 516). Callimachus alludes to the dire consequences of vying with the goddess in ἐλαφηβολία, and so we may tacitly commend Ascanius for not boasting of his kill. In this connection the Numanus Remulus episode in Book 9 may be contrasted: there Ascanius (again as archer) bears an aspect not of Agamemnon but of Artemis (avenging a boast), and Numanus pays the ultimate price. In the rousing congratulatory epiphany that follows one detects the presence of another line from Callimachus' hymns: 2.9 ὠπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαείνεται, ἀλλ' ὅ τις ἐσθλος. H. acutely cites the nightingale simile from *Georgics* 4 as a verbal parallel for 501–2 *questu . . . tectum omne replebat*, but the wider implication goes unremarked: what Virgil's animals suffer at the hands of humans is figured in the language of human suffering. The purity of such grief, too, is important to Virgil, who returns to his *philomela* again and again as the model for the lonely laments of Andromache and of Euryalus' mother (noted in passing by Horsfall 3 and Hardie respectively). For 508 *rimanti* the crucial (and equally nasty) parallel is 6.599, of the vulture that 'rummages about' in Tityos' liver. On *telum ira facit*, no mention of *furor arma ministrat* at 1.150 (better is Conington — connections between Books 1 and 7 deserve our notice). H. mentions Henry's long note on 510 *spirans immane* without saying what he thinks of it — not always a sign of disapproval, but the note is wonderful, and deserves better.

H. is aware of (and fond of discussing) the merits and defects of La Cerda, Heyne/Wagner, Forbiger, Conington/Nettleship, and Henry, to say nothing of more modern commentators. These remarks offer a microhistory of Virgilian scholarship complementary to that found in Knauer, and do much to guide the *caeca vestigia* of the 'scholarly public' (from the book jacket of Horsfall 3). Now that La Cerda is available online, more of us may aspire to H.'s meticulousness.

A strong complaint: H. with his acerbic wit goes too far too often when criticizing articles in the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (*quorum pars magna fuit*, see n. *ad* 271). Whenever he senses an unpardonable lightness in the 'mixed bag', H. slings the *telum inmedicabile*. The *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* is always worthy of reference, if not reverence, and there is no need for such bilious bullying.

H. admits (Preface, viii–x) that he found Book 11 a text less rich, going so far as to title his second appendix '*Dormitatne Maro quoque*?' The reader nods also, but in approval: too often we accept the idea of an omniscient, infallible Virgil — a construct for which Macrobius (and the tradition behind him) must take the blame. Yet Horsfall 11 shows a richer poetic sensibility than Horsfall 7, and Horsfall 3 is proof that the evolution is ongoing. A good example is his treatment of the torchlit funeral procession at 11.142 ff., a set of comments as fine and elegant and readable as anything in Austin. The note on Cybele (*ad* 768) is astounding, and the treatment of Diomedes (p. 171, 'V. offers an elaborate, calculated "misquotation" of Homer's sacred text') will satisfy even the most neoteric fans of intertextuality.

Behind 11.24–5 (*egregias animas, quae sanguine nobis hanc patriam peperere suo*) is, I ween, Pericles' funeral oration (Thuc. 2.36.1–2, especially ὅσην ἔχομεν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἀπόνως ἡμῖν τοῖς

νῦν προσκατέλιπον). For the beautiful simile at 68–71, H. could have made much more of the opening of the Homeric Hymn to Demeter. We need not think of the *amentum* to grasp the meaning of 284 *quo turbine*. The discussion of firewalking (pp. 420–1) should have touched on Camilla herself, *pernicibus ignea plantis*. H. is very fond of self-reference (and what could be more Virgilian?), but this can become myopic. On 11.153 *saevo ... Marti*, there is simply 7.608 *saevi formidine Martis* with no further comment, and so H. all but forces his reader to have in hand Horsfall 7, where the relevant note is not worth the extra effort. Brilliant for Brill, dimmer for others.

The most useful and stimulating part of Horsfall 3 is its twenty-one-page essay on the growth of the *Aeneid*. H. convincingly argues that Books 2 and 3 belong to the earliest phase of composition, and sees in Book 3 'the work of a poet teaching himself or "working out" the possible techniques and manners of epic writing, only to find himself without time (and even perhaps inclination) to "clean up" the exuberant outcome' (xxix). This is a commendable perspective, much more sensitive than the dismissive attitude that guides most scholarship on *Aeneid* 3, and it yields fine results. H. is at his best where Virgil is at *his* best — his treatment of the Polydorus and Andromache episodes is attentive and innovative. Horsfall 3 shows its author more willing than ever to venture audacious ideas (e.g. *ad* 593 *immissaque barba*, '[d]oes the beard even suggest the age and authority of Homer, whose mouthpiece Achaem(enides) has become?') and more inclined to detect intricate etymological play. He has also become more selective of the parallels he cites. It would be useful to know what H. considers to be the importance of metrical equivalence and metrical position as criteria for our assessment of Virgil as a translator of Homer (e.g. 596 *ad Troiam* < ἐς Τροίην).

On line 278, there should have been some notice of the strong tension between the words *insperata* and *tandem*, which introduce the Actium episode, itself both surprising and inevitable for the reader. On line 578 H. cites Call., *H.* 4.143 f. (Briareus under Etna), saying that the passage has been 'inexplicably ignored hitherto' — in fact, included by La Cerda, who also should have received credit for quoting the *PV* (vv. 431–3) on line 577. Finally, it is important to consider Aeneas' reaction to the sudden death of Anchises (708–13) in terms of its model at *Il.* 17.401 ff.: Achilles never expected the death of Patroclus at all. H. and Knauer cite without comment 410 f. (first adduced by Ursinus), but the broader context adds a new dimension to our sense of Aeneas' loss, because it invites us to make the startling connection between Anchises and Patroclus.

It is still regrettably easy to get lost in the *dumeta* of H.'s parentheses. For this reason and for obvious others, these commentaries will remain forbidding to students. But it is fair to hope that they will inspire Virgil commentators to produce similarly thorough and useful work. Horsfall 2 is now well underway, and one eagerly awaits H.'s work on the Helen episode. Perhaps we can then hope for Horsfall 1, or Horsfall 6. It is a fine thing to see H.'s 'supertext' being woven.

University of Western Ontario MATTHEW CARTER

R. GIBSON, S. GREEN and A. SHARROCK (EDS), *THE ART OF LOVE: BIMILLENNIAL ESSAYS ON OVID'S* ARS AMATORIA *AND* REMEDIA AMORIS. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. Pp. xii + 375. ISBN 9-780-19927-777-3. £60.00.

R. ANCONA and E. GREENE (EDS), *GENDERED DYNAMICS IN LATIN LOVE POETRY*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005. Pp. ix+ 372. ISBN 0-80188-198-6. £36.50.

Most of the essays collected in *The Art of Love* began life as papers delivered at a conference held in September 2002 at the University of Manchester to mark the bimillennium of Ovid's erotodidactic cycle of poems, traditionally believed to have been brought to completion *c.* A.D. 2. The volume's declared aim is (vi) 'to galvanize current — and to stimulate new — research on the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*', and that objective is well met by sixteen contributions that are arranged in four categories: Poetics, Erotics, Politics, and Reception. As the editors themselves concede (vii), these divisions are 'somewhat artificial' in the lines that they draw between chapters that defy one-dimensional categorization; a conspicuous case in point is the Augustan significance that Roy Gibson goes on to adumbrate (cf. 138: 'a link between the characteristic "moderation" of *Ars* 3 and the "extreme" personality of Augustus') in his persuasive 'Ovid, Augustus, and the politics of moderation in *Ars Amatoria* 3', which nevertheless falls into the category of Erotics. Better structure for the volume is supplied by Steven Green's introductory 'Lessons in love: fifty years of scholarship on the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*': more enterprising than its title